

THE THEOLOGICAL CONCEPT OF PREACHING ACCORDING TO ST. THOMAS AQUINAS

WITH REFERENCE TO
ST. ALBERT THE GREAT AND ST. BONAVENTURE

by

REV. AUGUSTINE ROCK, O.P., S.T.Lr., M.A.



A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THEOLOGY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF FRIBOURG IN SWITZERLAND,
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR IN SACRED THEOLOGY.

THE THEOLOGICAL CONCEPT OF PREACHING ACCORDING TO ST. THOMAS AQUINAS

WITH REFERENCE TO
ST. ALBERT THE GREAT AND ST. BONAVENTURE

by

REV. AUGUSTINE ROCK, O.P., S.T.Lr., M.A.

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THEOLOGY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF FRIBOURG IN SWITZERLAND,
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR IN SACRED THEOLOGY.

WM. C. BROWN COMPANY
P u b l i s h e r s
DUBUQUE, IOWA

Revisores Ordinis:

Patritius Roney, O.P.
Cyrillus Geary, O.P.

Imprimi potest:

Eduardus Hughes, O.P.
Prior Provincialis.

Die 1 octobris 1952

Nihil obstat:

Joannes A. Driscoll, O.P.
Censor Librorum.

Imprimatur:

✠Henricus P. Rohlman
Archiepiscopus Dubuquensis.

Die 18 novembris 1952

Copyright 1953

by

Aquinas Library

Wm. C. Brown Co.

CHAPTER V

The Canonical Mission

Formal Cause of Preaching

The substantial formal cause of a thing is the form which by inhering in matter makes a thing to be what it is and not to be anything else. A thing is able to have many accidental formal causes which can vary widely without changing the nature of the thing itself. Having seen the matter of preaching it is necessary to determine, if possible, just what makes preaching to be the ministry to which our Lord charged His apostles and nothing else.

That the ministry of the word or preaching is a distinctive ministry which requires not only a license or a right but also a power without which it cannot be performed is certain. The Council of Trent declares: "If anyone says that all Christians have the *power* to administer the word and all the sacraments, let him be anathema."¹ It is significant that the fathers of the council gathered together the ministry of preaching and that of the sacraments. St. Paul asks, "And how are men to preach unless they be sent?"² It is necessary to determine in what this *sending* consists and what its relation is to preaching. It is plain that a man completely lacking in any special power or authority can stand up and

deliver precisely the same words as can another man equipped with both of the qualities mentioned. Does the latter preach while the former does not preach? Or is it simply a question of whether the former preaches legitimately or not? If the first question can be answered in the affirmative, it seems that we are on the track of the precise note which makes preaching to be preaching and without which preaching does not exist.

The question may be expressed in a slightly different way. There is, for example, no such thing as an essentially bad Mass. A Mass is either good, or it is no Mass at all. An Episcopalian priest cannot be said to be saying Mass. Whatever motions he goes through, whatever words he may say, he is simply not saying a Mass at all. Is the same thing true when he mounts the pulpit? Even if, *per accidens*, he says nothing which is not in accord with Catholic doctrine can he be said to be preaching in the strict sense of the term? Can he be said to be performing the ministry established by Christ when he said, "Go into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature."³ If it can be established that he is not preaching at all, then it must be because he lacks the commission to preach. If this is the case, the commission to preach makes a certain physical act to be preaching, a physical act which if performed without that commission would not be preaching. The conclusion could then be drawn that the canonical mission fulfills the function of the quasi-substantial form of preaching.

This is neither an idle nor an unimportant question. To our Protestant brethren, however, it is far more urgent than to us. For them there is only preaching. Karl Barth, the eminent Swiss Protestant theologian, says: "It

is very clear that the Reformation wished to see something better substituted for the mass it abolished, and that it expected that that better thing would be — our preaching of the Word. The *verbum visibile*, the objectively clarified preaching of the Word, is the only sacrament left to us. The Reformers sternly took from us everything but the Bible.”⁴ Having done away with the sacramental system, proclaiming that men, including ministers of the so-called reformed church, are in no way specially prepared by God or set apart by Him, the Protestants are left to wonder what their position is. They are left with the question: “What is preaching? — not How *does* one do it? but How *can* one do it?”⁵ By what authority does a man speak God’s word? Why should anyone listen to him? Barth sees the problem. “What are you doing, you man, with the word of *God* upon *your* lips? Upon what grounds do you assume the rôle of mediator between heaven and earth? Who has authorized you to take your place there and to generate religious feeling? . . . One does not with impunity cross the boundaries of mortality! One does not with impunity usurp the prerogative of God!”⁶

Barth certainly sees the problem. It is difficult to see how he misses the basis on which the answer must rest. His answer, as it must, simply begs the question: “And here above all is a *man*, upon whom the expectation of the apparently imminent event seems to rest in a special way, not only because he has studied the technique of the event and is supposed to have mastered it, not only because he is paid and employed by the community or is tolerated almost without opposition in the function evidently associated with the event, but also

because freedom is displayed here as well as law: the man himself chose this profession, God knows from what understanding or misunderstanding of it, and he has now for better or for worse wedded his short, his only life to the expectation of the event.”⁷ Having made this statement which answers nothing he remarks, “How incomparably more securely, uninterruptedly, and confidently the other church goes its way having wisely left this dangerous principle of the word undiscovered.”⁸ The absurdity of this statement is patent. Perhaps he would not have been able to make it so confidently had Catholic theologians clarified more precisely their position regarding the essence of the preaching office. A recent writer remarks: “The elaboration of a doctrinal synthesis on this subject demands the attention of modern theologians. We have a tract on the Church, we have a tract on the sacraments. How does one explain the continued lack of a tract on preaching?”⁹ For Protestants, who depend entirely upon preaching, the determination of its essence, as urgent as it is, within the framework of their position, is impossible. If it is urgent for them, it is at least important for us. For us there is no reason why this question should not yield to a solution.

We are not here concerned with an analysis of the theology of Karl Barth. This has been done far more competently than we could hope to do it. His position is mentioned here as that of a particularly influential Protestant theologian in order to throw light from one direction on the significance of the problem at hand. Conversely, it is not a question here of solving the problem. We propose merely to work towards a solution by seeking to discover the position of St. Thomas Aquinas

in regard to the problem and, incidently, the position of St. Albert the Great. What was their understanding of the canonical mission in itself, and did they consider this canonical mission to be essential to the ministry of preaching or only accidental?

It has thus far been more or less presumed that what must be proposed as the formal cause of preaching in order to remain consistent with the doctrine of St. Albert and St. Thomas is the canonical mission. Do the two doctors say so? No text has been found in the writings of St. Thomas that says so explicitly. St. Albert, however, is quite explicit in placing the formal cause of preaching in the canonical mission, and it seems by no means too heavy a burden for the texts of St. Thomas to bear the same interpretation.

St. Albert says that "preaching has the form of the gospel well proclaimed, and this form is grace."¹⁰ Now the gospel well proclaimed is the gospel proclaimed according to due order, namely, by those sent to proclaim it, by those equipped with the grace of the word. He is more specific in speaking of the mission of John. "The Lord sent him to preach, otherwise he would not have preached. *That therefore, is the word of the Lord which is proposed by one the Lord has sent*, in whose possession is the authority to send."¹¹ Thus, without due mission, there is no preaching. Only the word proposed by one duly sent is indeed the word of the Lord, or preaching. Finally, St. Albert specifically calls the mission the form of preaching: He says: "The mission confers authority. And in this it gives the *form*, lest anyone should teach without having the Spirit, without being imbued

with unction, and without having the authority of the mission."¹² It is evident, then, that St. Albert asserts that the canonical mission is the formal cause of preaching.

It does not seem unreasonable to presume that St. Thomas holds the same view of the canonical mission as his master, St. Albert. For this reason it seems that the texts of St. Thomas can be interpreted in such wise. Of course, it is necessary to be sure that the texts will bear such an interpretation without being forced. We seek to discover the thought of St. Thomas, not to make St. Thomas agree with a preconceived notion.

In examining St. Thomas' thought on this important question, we must begin with what is certain. There is no doubt that St. Thomas held that anyone who presumed to preach without being sent would act illegitimately. This is not surprising for it was the least he could have held in the light of the Scripture. He says, "It is not licit for anyone to preach unless he holds the office of a prelate, or has authority from someone who holds this office."¹³ But to say that in order to preach legitimately it is necessary to have a canonical mission does not warrant the assertion that in the mind of the Saint the mission is the precise element which makes preaching to be preaching and without which it would not be preaching. In his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, however, he seems to express himself somewhat stronger. Here he says that because preachers do not have the faith from themselves, but from God, unless they are sent by God they are unfit to preach.¹⁴ He uses the expression *non digne*, which does not necessarily mean any more than unworthy. One is not necessarily

non capax because *non digne*. Thus it is impossible to rest a case on this text.

In one of his later writings, the 12th question of the *Quodlibetales*, which Mandonnet places about 1270, he asks the question: "Whether anyone is able to preach on his own authority," but he goes on to clarify his question saying, "so that it would be licit to preach without the license of a prelate." It seems, therefore, that he will say no more than he has said in the other texts already examined. However, as he sometimes does, St. Thomas answers this question more strongly than he asked it. He replies: "No one, no matter how great his learning, or how great his sanctity, unless sent by God or by a prelate *is able to preach*." But is this mode of expression in the response not already weakened by the clarification of the question? It would seem so except for the reason that is offered for the response. The argument runs thus: "No agent comes into being in such a way as to be able to act except on proportionate matter; but preaching and exhortation and doctrine, if they be public regarding the whole Church, and the care of the Church, are committed to the prelate." In stating his conclusion, he draws from the argument only what is necessary to answer his question: "Therefore, no one should exercise what requires public authority except the prelate."¹⁵ Were it necessary to rest this interpretation entirely on the words of the text, it would still seem to be a valid interpretation, but doubt would certainly remain that it is the only valid interpretation. Fortunately, it is not necessary to interpret a text entirely on its own strength. It is necessary to consider it in the light of

the rest of the writer's doctrine. Taking the general doctrine of St. Thomas into consideration, it seems hard to deny that the interpretation offered is the only possible one. It is the teaching of St. Thomas that "a minister is of the nature of an instrument."¹⁶ Despite the fact that there is a difference between the concept of ministry in relation to the sacraments and the concept of ministry in relation to the preaching office, yet in both cases the exercise of the office is called ministry and in consequence, participates to some extent at least in the notion of instrumental causality. "(Paul) says, 'my gospel,' although he cannot say my baptism, *though he is a minister as to both*, because in baptism the efforts of the man work nothing, while in the preaching of the gospel, the efforts of the man do work."¹⁷ Now, a cause which is only partially instrumental is still not principal and still not capable of effecting the whole work itself. Thus, in the absence of the canonical mission which is the application of the principal cause to the instrumental cause, the instrumental cause will not truly and properly accomplish the work. If it did, it would be itself the principal cause, and would no longer be a minister. A motor which runs an automobile will never move the automobile so much as an inch unless someone sets it to work to do so. A horse, however, capable of the physical act of drawing a wagon without any assistance, is nevertheless still an instrumental cause so far as it will not draw the wagon ordinally or for any purpose (except *per accidens*) without the direction of a principal cause. Thus, though St. Thomas nowhere states, as St. Albert does, that the canonical mission is the formal cause which

makes preaching to be preaching, nevertheless, what he does say, interpreted in the light of his general teaching, leads to that conclusion.

An examination of two texts from the commentaries on the epistles will further elucidate and substantiate the conclusion that has been drawn as to the mind of St. Thomas. On the first Epistle to Timothy he says: "Timothy was constituted in the office of a minister of Christ, because everyone having the office of preaching and of ruling is constituted a minister of Christ."¹⁸ The preacher is a minister. What he does he does not do of himself, but by the power and authority of his Master. "Thence when he says, 'according to the gift of grace etc.' he touches on the help furnished him for the execution of his ministry. Such help is twofold. Upon one kind is consequent the faculty itself, upon the other the operation or actualization of a faculty. God gives the faculty by infusing power and grace, through which a man is given the power and rendered apt to working; but He confers the operation itself so far as He works in us by moving interiorly and by instigation to good."¹⁹ That this double grace in the case of preaching is the mission can hardly be doubted to be the mind of St. Thomas. "All power in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world."²⁰ And again, "But they went forth and preached everywhere, while the Lord worked with them."²¹

Finally, a passing remark of St. Thomas might be mentioned to indicate that he was thinking of the preaching ministry as one demanding and receiving the special operation akin to that of a primary efficient cause on an instrumental cause. "It is plain that the apostolic office is to preach the truth; it is thus not moved to the contrary of the truth, which is to lie."²²

The collection of evidence seems sufficient to establish beyond a reasonable doubt the thesis that if St. Thomas were asked what the formal cause of preaching would be, what should be said to be that which makes preaching preaching, he would have answered that it is the mission, the sending, without which the speaker is not a preacher nor are his words preaching. If preaching is to announce the word of God, then if one be not sent by God, how can he be said to preach? His words are his own, not the word of God.

That the mission confers the right to preach there is no doubt. "None has the right to preach save him who is sent; . . . Other men may be sent forth to preach at the bidding of bishops, but all thus sent must be regarded as the emissaries of the Lord; because it is by His power that they receive their commission. And all who are thus authorized to preach must . . . be regarded as the coadjutors of the bishops, because they are rendering them important assistance. . . . When any priest, bearing the commission of a bishop, preaches, this function is accounted as having been performed by the bishop himself."²³ And St. Albert the Great tells us that the preacher is possessed of three benefits: the grace of preaching, spiritual joy, and (as the cause of the first

two) God within him. The grace of preaching, he says, is to be a chariot carrying God to unnumbered multitudes (*currus portans Deum innumeris*). God is in preachers by a command which is good, holy, and just, and this command is not fulfilled unless God Himself be the helper.²⁴ He thus identifies the grace of preaching and the mission (command) to preach.

The question is, does the mission confer an obligation to preach? Each of the apostles had a universal mission. Some among them, however, were specially sent to certain groups. Thus they had an obligation to preach to those to whom they were especially sent, though they had the right to preach to others. The mission essentially gives the right to preach, but may in certain cases also give the obligation. This is the case with those who receive the mission by reason of the cure of souls, principally the bishop. St. Thomas says of St. Paul: "He was commissioned to preach to the Gentiles in such a way that he was held necessarily to preach to them . . . , however, he was not prohibited from preaching to the Jews, although he was not held to this."²⁵

Evidence has been offered that St. Thomas and St. Albert considered the mission necessary as the formal cause of preaching. There are certain comments of the two Doctors that serve to emphasize this necessity and to add some notes or properties to the concept. St. Thomas points out that the mission was considered so essential by Christ that He Himself declined to preach except to those to whom He was sent. "Our Lord said (Mt., xv, 24): 'I was not sent but to the sheep that are lost of the house of Israel.' And (Rom. x, 15) it is writ-

ten: 'How shall they preach unless they be sent?' Therefore Christ should not have preached to the Gentiles."²⁶ One who preaches only so far as he exercises a ministry and participates in the mission of Christ can hardly do otherwise considering the example of our Lord Himself. "It was through the triumph of the Cross that Christ merited power and lordship over the Gentiles."²⁷ Thus "Christ was given to be the light and salvation of the Gentiles through His disciples, whom He sent to preach to them."²⁸ The disciples, therefore, on the commission and by the example of the Master preach only as sent. St. Albert says: "*Et ego mitto vos*" by giving My authority: that who hears you, hears Me: and who rejects you, rejects Me. . . . For by this mission He confers authority."²⁹ By the mission the preacher is united to Christ. Confession heard without the necessary jurisdiction cannot lead to valid absolution. So, too, preaching without the necessary jurisdiction which is conferred by the mission is invalid. "Preaching and hearing confessions are dependent upon both jurisdiction and orders."³⁰ One who would attempt to preach without being sent, without the necessary jurisdiction, is an imposter and should be rejected as a "pretender who comes to you not sent, but on his own, as a thief and a robber."³¹ The mission is necessary by reason of the end, for it is the means prepared by God for the salvation of the people. Were preachers not sent, it would be a violation of the promise of God. "God is faithful, i.e., He fulfills His promises. But He has promised to send you preachers of the truth."³² One who presumes to preach despite the fact that he has not been sent can only fail. This is the lesson St. Albert draws from the nets let down by the apostles

with no results until they are let down at the command of Christ. The nets are sermons which when they are let down before the Lord has prepared hearts and commanded the preacher will bring up nothing.³³

A modern canon lawyer has defined the canonical mission as "a positive declaration of ecclesiastical authority to teach the Christian religion in a public manner."³⁴ St. Albert and St. Thomas add a number of notions. St. Albert places as the *finis* of the apostolic mission, the preaching itself, for, as we have seen, he proposed the mission as the formal cause of preaching.³⁵ On the words *Et misit illos* he says: "For He sent them that in them His authority should be honored and His will should be exposed to all through them, that the faith should be preached through them, and that all who do not believe through them should be convicted of infidelity."³⁶ St. Albert points out that in the command to preach, four things can be distinguished: "The mode of preaching the word, the word to be preached, the authority of the one commanding, and the sublimity of preaching itself."³⁷ And he points out the correlative obligation of obedience on the part of the one sent as to "the place of preaching, the thing to be preached, and the end of preaching."³⁸ In this way St. Albert conceives the extensiveness of the mission to preach. For St. Thomas the mission extends to the same objectives, for both see in the command of the Lord expressed in the Scriptures much the same thing (though the texts quoted from St. Albert are from his commentary on St. Luke, while that of St. Thomas is from his commentary on St. Matthew). St. Thomas says: "Four things are ordered:

first, where they should go; secondly, what they are to say; thirdly, what they must do; and finally, to what end."³⁹ The relation of the mission to the office of preaching, its necessity and its extent have been seen. It now remains to show the source of the mission.

From all that has been said it is apparent that the apostolic mission to preach cannot be assumed by a man of his own accord, for such a one would be no more than a "thief and a robber." It would be strictly to usurp, or to assume something to which one has no right and on which one has no claim. Preachers must "proceed ordinately, not usurping to themselves the preaching office."⁴⁰ Ultimately, they must be sent by Him Who alone can send, Who has Himself been sent. "And He sent them, as He Himself was sent, that is, to preach."⁴¹ It is necessary that preachers be sent by Christ, for it is by His authority and in His place that they act. "Apostle means the same as one sent. For they are sent by Christ, as holding His authority and His place . . . , that is, with the fullness of authority."⁴² And, indeed, the source of their mission can be no other, for their word is the word of Christ. It is at the word of Christ that they are sent.⁴³ Before Christ, as St. Albert points out, the mission of John the Baptist was conferred through the Scriptures.⁴⁴ But even there, of what did the Scriptures treat but of the mission of Christ? "You search the Scriptures, . . . and it is they that bear witness to me."⁴⁵

St. Thomas mentions three ways in which the office of proposing the faith may come. He says it may come "from the dignity of position as to priests, from revelation

as to prophets, or from ministry as to doctors and preachers."⁴⁶ As this is mentioned after the manner of an *obiter dictum* there is no reason to suppose that he is offering anything at variance with his ordinary teaching, so he undoubtedly means by priests, those priests who have the cure of souls. Thus the first and third are reducible to one, and we find that there are two manners of obtaining the commission to preach: one the extraordinary manner, through direct revelation, as the prophets properly so-called; and the other, those who are commissioned by the Church, namely, those with the duty of preaching by very reason of their office in the Church, such as bishops and parish priests, and those delegated to the office of preaching such as the doctors and preachers.

In his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, St. Thomas explains more completely the source of the mission. First he speaks of the hearers, then of the preachers. Speaking of the verse, "But how shall they believe in him whom they have not heard?" he says: "A man is said to believe those things which are said to him by others, but which he himself does not see. . . . Now there are two ways of hearing: one is interior, by which one hears from God revealing, the other way of hearing is when a man hears another man exteriorly speaking. . . . The first hearing does not commonly pertain to all, but properly pertains to the grace of prophecy, which is a gratuitous grace given only to some, but not to all. . . . But as now those things are spoken of which can pertain to all without distinction . . . therefore it must be that this passage should be understood of the second hearing. Therefore, he (Paul) goes on to say: 'How can

they hear if no one preaches to them?' For external hearing is a passive thing on the part of the hearer which cannot exist without the action of a speaker. Thus the Lord ordered His disciples to 'go into the whole world, preach the gospel to every creature.' But those things which are of faith, preachers do not have of themselves, but from God. . . . Therefore the Apostle adds, 'How then shall they preach unless they be sent?' as if to say, they would not be fit." Having thus considered the passive element, or the hearer, he now passes to a consideration of the active element, or the preacher, in order to inquire how the mission comes to the preacher. "Preachers are sent by the Lord in two ways. In one way, immediately by God Himself through internal inspiration. The sign of a mission of this kind is sometimes the authority of the Sacred Scriptures. Thus the mission of John the Baptist . . . (note that, as has been pointed out above, St. Albert the Great had observed the same case of Scriptural authority). Sometimes, however, the sign of this mission is the truth of those things which are announced. But sometimes the sign of this mission is the working of miracles. . . . However, neither of these last two sufficiently demonstrate the mission of God. . . . In another manner some are sent by God by means of the authority of prelates, who hold the place of God."⁴⁷ It is obvious that the first, or interior, mission is extraordinary while the second is the ordinary manner of the mission being communicated.

As the Scriptures provide for no further preachers except those who are the successors of the apostles, the only sure sign of a true interior mission has been ex-

hausted. The other two signs of such a mission, as St. Thomas points out, are inadequate, for the truth can be preached *per accidens*, and miracles can be simulated. There remains, then, in our times only the mission communicated through the Church as certainly acceptable. As St. Bonaventure says: "The first evident sign that one has been sent to preach the gospel is the authority of the one sending, which is the bishop, and especially the chief bishop who holds the place of Peter, or rather the place of Jesus Christ so that whoever is sent by him is sent by Christ."⁴⁸ This position, entirely reasonable and supported by Scripture, in regard to the mission cuts the ground from under the entire Protestant position. For the Protestant the mission must either be an outright assumption on the part of a man, or a vague interior mission of some sort. As we have noted, Karl Barth places a man's right to preach in the fact that "the man himself chose this profession."⁴⁹ Aware of the insufficiency of such an answer he attempts to find some sort of an interior mission. "As the minister of the Bible he must be the first to be prepared to submit to God's question by asking the question about God, without which God's answer cannot be given. If he answers the people's question but answers it as a man who has himself been questioned by God, then he speaks — the words of God; and this is what the people seek in him and *what God has commissioned him to speak*. For being truly questioned by God and truly questioning about God, he will know God's answer and so be able to give it to the people, who with their question really want God's answer even when they do not realize it."⁵⁰ He thus sees the mission in some kind of an interior communica-

tion with God on the part of the preacher. But his communication must rise out of the need of men and so when these things are fulfilled the mission is present. "It is ours to take upon ourselves the great question of God, the question which utterly humbles and even kills all flesh, and to do so not in a comfortable, expansive way as men in general might, but — since nobody is a man in general — in our very capacity as priests, as mediators. It is not until then that we shall be capable of being 'priests' (*Geistliche*), that is, of hearing God's answer and then answering the question of men. Not until our preaching arises from need will our work become a *mission*. *Mission alone can legitimize preaching.*"⁵¹ What a pitiful interpretation of St. Paul's, "How can they preach unless they be sent?" But if the Church is rejected such substitutes must be fallen back upon. How much more reasonable and more scriptural is St. Thomas' clear explanation of the source of the mission of preaching.

St. Thomas has a number of things to say about the ordinary communication of the apostolic mission, which should now be mentioned. The apostolic mission to preach the gospel has its source in Christ. As the Church is the Mystical Body of Christ, Christ living in the world, ordinarily the mission comes through the Church, or it can even be strictly said, from the Church. Because, as has been shown, the two possible signs of a mission directly and interiorly given are insufficient to prove its validity, and as the only sign capable of proving the validity of such a mission is now impossible, it must be said that, in the final analysis, the only certainly valid mission is given by the Church. Just as in the case of the sacraments, the power of God is not thereby limited.

He is always capable of making other disposition of His power, but certainly in the ordinary course of events and as far as we know, the apostolic mission is to be sought and discovered only in the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church.

In the Church the mission to preach is granted in two ways. It is either granted together with an office concerned with the cure of souls, such as a bishop or a pastor, or it is granted by delegation. St. Thomas says: "Prelates are competent to preach in virtue of their office, but religious may be competent to do so in virtue of delegation."⁵² The same idea is found in the legislation of the time. For example, the Synod of Buda in 1279 published this canon: "Only those should be allowed to preach who have official charges, or who show the privilege of the Holy See or of the bishop."⁵³ The office of preaching, therefore, is the result of either the cure of souls or of delegation, which may be more or less permanent, resulting in a kind of profession as a preacher. St. Albert points out that "who has either the cure of souls or the profession of preaching, receives the office of sowing."⁵⁴ The profession of preaching as distinct from the cure of souls, he sees to have its source in the delegated sending out. "Who sows is the sower who received the office of sowing by the reception of a pastoral charge or by being sent out."⁵⁵ This more or less permanent delegation to preach, this formation of a profession of preaching apart from the ordinary *cura animarum*, was an innovation shortly before the time of St. Albert and St. Thomas. Indeed, the innovator was none other than the founder of the Order to which they belonged,

the Order of Preachers. St. Dominic was in this way responsible for a reform in the cure of souls.⁵⁶ Principally and of its very nature, however, the preaching office belongs to the bishop. “‘*Et erat praedicans.*’ Behold,” says St. Albert, “the act of the office for which bishops are consecrated, as can be seen in the ceremony of consecration.”⁵⁷ And in the introduction to his commentary on the 8th chapter of the Gospel according to St. Luke he notes that the prelates of the Church are instructed concerning the office of preaching and teaching “for which the episcopal order was established.”⁵⁸ The bishop has always been the Church’s official preacher and St. Thomas also assigns to him the office of preaching in the strict sense of the term. In listing four kinds of instruction he gives as the fourth, “the instruction in the profound mysteries of faith, and on the perfection of Christian life: this belongs to bishops *ex officio*, — in virtue of their office.”⁵⁹ The bishop, who alone is the direct successor of the apostles, likewise alone possesses the full plenitude of the preaching authority by the very virtue of his office itself. Other preachers must be delegated.

No one who has not the cure of souls, no matter what his qualifications may be, can undertake to preach without the delegation of the bishop, by which he receives the apostolic mission, or as shall be shown, shares in the apostolic mission. St. Thomas in his defence of the right of religious to engage in the works of the ministry refers to “monks, who presuming on their sanctity, by their own volition usurp the office of ministers of the Church, namely by absolving sinners and by preaching without the

authority of the bishop, which is in no wise permissible to them.”⁶⁰ As far as religious are concerned, their profession demands of them that they have an additional license to preach, that of their superior who has dominion over them. “Religious are not less suitable to fulfilling the office of preaching than are seculars, unless it be so far as they are constituted under obedience, and so they need a double license for preaching, namely the license of him to whom is committed the care of the people, and the license of the prelate of their order, which they need to perform any work legally.”⁶¹ It remains to determine the relation which exists between the delegated preacher and the prelate who himself preaches *ex officio* and has delegated the preacher to his office.

The apostolic mission directly conferred upon a bishop is shared by those preachers who are delegated by him to assist him in the performance of the office which is primarily and directly his. St. Thomas reminds us that while it is true that no one preaches unless he be sent to do so, nevertheless, “those sent by the Lord, are able to send others. So from the commission of bishops and priests many others as well can be sent to preach. These also are understood to be sent by the Lord, for they are sent by power received from the Lord. All those so sent by the prelates of the Church are counted among their coadjutors, for they bear their burden in important matters. When anyone preaches or hears confessions on the commission of the bishop, it is understood as done by the bishop himself.”⁶² Despite the fact that many privileges were granted to the great orders of friars, great care was taken to preserve intact the rights of the bishops.

Though the individual friars or groups of friars sometimes interpreted their privileges in too wide a sense thereby arousing the just anger of the bishops, the orders themselves always found themselves at the service of the bishops, not replacements for the bishops.⁶³

Though the subject will be treated at length under the efficient cause of preaching, a word should be said here of the recipient of the apostolic mission. What did St. Thomas consider to be the basic requirement for the subject of the apostolic mission? Is it possible to confer this mission on anyone at all, or must the proposed subject possess certain prerequisites? The important basis is the reception of the sacrament of orders. This has been considered so important in the history of the Church that whenever groups of the laity have begun to attempt to preach, the matter has been viewed with great concern and every effort has been made to prudently put an end to this abuse. For example, among the interrogations put to the Wycliffites and Hussites by the Council of Constance in order to determine their orthodoxy was: "Whether they believed that it is licit for lay persons, either men or women, to freely preach the word of God."⁶⁴ It was certainly the view of St. Thomas that sacred orders were necessary in order to preach in the proper sense of the term. He says: "Preaching and hearing confessions are dependent upon both jurisdiction and orders."⁶⁵ He also points out that the office of preaching in the strict sense belongs to bishops in such a way that they are not even to delegate it without absolute necessity, but are to fulfill it themselves. This, he says, is because the merit and wisdom of the minister

are matters of consequence in securing the end of preaching.⁶⁶ This being true, the apostolic mission should be given to him who is best suited from the point of view of merit and wisdom, for he will be most successful in fulfilling the office. This is why the life of religious, which is directed towards perfection and uses the most direct and suitable means thereto, is particularly suited to preparing men for the office of preaching. "So far as any one is on a higher plane, by so much will he be more powerful in those things . . . Thus if secular priests who have not the cure of souls can be delegated to preach, much more are religious able to carry out this office if it be committed to them."⁶⁷ St. Thomas has much more to say regarding the qualifications necessary in one who is to receive the apostolic mission to preach. These qualifications will be discussed at length when the treatment of the efficient cause of preaching is undertaken.

The word preached by one who holds the proper mission is not his own word but the word of Christ. This is because Christ sent others to preach just as He Himself had been sent by the Father. "As the Father has sent me, I also send you."⁶⁸ But Christ was sent in such a way that He did not preach His own word, but the word of His Father. "My teaching is not my own, but His who sent me."⁶⁹ Thus the preacher offers nothing of his own, but only that which he has been commissioned to offer. "He who speaks on his own authority seeks his own glory. But he who seeks the glory of the one who sent him is truthful, and there is no injustice in him."⁷⁰ Because the word that he speaks is not his own, but that of his Master Who is Christ, it is a word of power.

“For He was teaching them as one having authority, and not as the scribes.”⁷¹ The word of the preacher works great wonders, for by reason of the mission of the preacher the word that is on his tongue is not a human word. “That a man speaks with effect pertains to the grace of the word. This happens in three ways. First, in order to instruct the intellect, and this is the case when a man speaks so as to teach. Secondly, in order to move the affections, so that a man willingly hearkens to the word of God. This is the case when a man speaks so as to please his hearers, not indeed with a view to his own favor, but in order to draw them to listen to God’s word. Thirdly, in order that men may love that which is signified by the word, and desire to fulfill it, and this is the case when a man so speaks as to sway his hearers. In order to effect this the Holy Ghost makes use of the human tongue as of an instrument; but He it is Who perfects the work within.”⁷² By the power of God’s grace, preaching is efficacious. “The efficacy of preaching belongs to all the apostles from one source, the grace of God.”⁷³ St. Bonaventure says that “on the word of the preacher itself, God confers power or the grace of preaching and of edification.”⁷⁴ St. Albert the Great mentions that the word “in authority, subtlety, truth and utility, excels every word. In authority, because the most authoritative God is the Author. Thus the prophet did not usurp the word to himself but called himself the pen of the author.”⁷⁵ Its power is because it is God’s word. It is the word of God because God has sent a man to preach it. *Qui facit per alium, facit per se.* St. Albert offers a beautiful passage on the pow-

er of the word: "Here (Lk. viii) begins the part about the power of the word preached in which Christ confirms His disciples as to the consequence of the word which is committed to them to be preached. For it is necessary that first they should see and experience themselves the power of the word of God, that afterwards the same power be committed to them. And this is the perfection of the apostolic and episcopal order. . . . This word in all its power is committed to the apostles and to apostolic bishops; thus it is proper that they should have a true experiencing of its power, both in the macrocosm and in the microcosm."⁷⁶ The word of the preacher is a word of power, because it is the word of God by reason of the divine commission, the apostolic mission, that makes a man a preacher, a minister of God, an instrument of the divine by which the tongue of a man speak the word of God.

When a systematic tract on preaching is prepared, it will find its validity in the analysis of the concept of the mission, the formal cause of preaching. For the tongue of a man to be raised above itself, to be given powers far beyond those which it possesses by nature. That the tongue of a man be made capable of uttering the words of God, is the astonishing miracle of grace which makes preaching a matter for true theological investigation. It is the beginning of the direct line of communication between preaching and the formal object of the science of theology. "For he whom God has sent speaks the words of God."⁷⁷ The mission, the sending, which is directly controlled by the Church and which gives preaching its being as a supernatural reality, places the tract on preaching in direct dependence on the tract on the Church.

Thus through the Mystical Body of Christ, through the Incarnation, it finds its way to the very bosom of the Godhead from Whom it proceeds in the supernatural order.

A number of theologians are beginning to realize the need for a rapid and accurate development of this tract. There are many reasons for this necessity, among the least of which is the negative one that in this tract will be found a most direct and telling blow at the whole Protestant position which is entirely dependent upon the "ministry of preaching" for its very existence. A more important reason, a vastly more important reason for the investigation of this question, is the tremendous impetus it would give to the zealous, devout and effective undertaking and execution of this "most important of the offices confided to the apostles." What an inspiration it would be to the seminarian to know, not only in an obscure but in a distinct way, the grandeur, the importance, the sanctity, the precise supernatural nature of the work to which he is destined to devote many weary but soul-enriching hours of his priestly life! What an encouragement to the priest to better prepare himself for this sacred work! And to take it up more frequently and with a better heart! Would it not do much to change the conditions which prompted a recent European observer of the Church in the United States to say: "*Ueber die Predigt klagt man wohl in der ganzen Welt, auch in Amerika*"?⁷⁸ It is to be hoped that it will not be long until the importance of this tract is recognized and it finds a place among the concepts which formulate the spiritual and sacerdotal life of the priest. So much for its pragmatic value. The most important reason of all for the develop-

ment of this tract is the perfection of theological knowledge by which the intellect of a man is perfected in knowledge and wisdom. It is a lacuna which cries out to be filled by accurate theological speculation. By focusing the development of this tract around the concept of mission, the action of God in the world, the relation of man to God will be better understood. Is not such a glorious result enough to give any intellectual effort reason and meaning?

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. Session VII, canon 10.
2. Rom., x, 15.
3. Mk., xvi, 15.
4. *The Word of God and the Word of Man*, p. 114.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 103.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 125 f.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 105 f.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 112.
9. Père Jérôme Hamer, op, "La théologie et la prédication" in *Evangeliser*, jan., 1950, p. 377.
10. ". . . et praedicatis dabat formam evangelii boni nuntio, quae forma est gratia." In Mt., ix, 35 (xx, p. 436).
11. "Ecce auctoritas. Dominus enim misit eum ad praedicandum et aliter non praedicaret. Hoc igitur est verbum Domini, quod proponitur mittente Domino, penes quem est auctoritas missionis." In Lc., iii, 2 (xxii, p. 265).
12. "Missio autem confert auctoritatem. Et in hoc formam dat ne aliquis doceat nisi Spiritum habeat, et unctione doctus sit, et auctoritatem habeat missionis." In Lc., iv, 14-22 (xxii, p. 320).
13. "non enim licet alicui praedicare, nisi officium praelationis habeat, vel ex auctoritate alicujus praelationem habentis." In *Sent.*, Lib. IV, d. xix, q. 2, art. 2, q. 2, ad 4.
14. "Ea vero quae fidei sunt, praedicatores a semetipsis non habent, sed a Deo . . . Et ideo Apostolus subdit, 'Quomodo vero praedicabunt nisi mittantur?' quasi dicat, non digne." In *Rom.*, cap. 10, lect. 2.
15. "nullus, quantumcumque scientiae magnae, vel quantumcumque sanctitatis, nisi missus a Deo vel a praelato praedicare potest . . . nullum agens natum est agere nisi super debitam materiam; praedicatio autem et exhortatio et doctrina, si sit publica respiciens totam Ecclesiam, et cura publica Ecclesiae commissa est praelato . . . et ideo nullus debet aliquid exercere quod requirat auctoritatem publicam nisi praelati." Q. *Quodl.*, q. 12, art. 27.
16. III, q. 64, art. 1.
17. "Dicit autem: Evangelium meum, quamvis non possit dicere baptismum suum, et sit utriusque minister, quia in baptismo nihil operatur industria hominis, sed in Evangelio praedicando industria praedicatoris operatur." In *Rom.*, cap. 2, lect. 3.
18. "Timotheus enim constitutus erat in officio ministerii Christi, quia omnes habentes officium praedicandi et regendi constituuntur ministri Christi." In *I ad Tim.*, cap. 4, lect. 2.

19. "Deinde cum dicit: 'Secundum donum gratiae, etc.' tangit auxilium sibi praestitum ad ministeriorum executionem. Hujusmodi autem auxilium duplex fuit. Unum quidem ipsa facultas exequendi, aliud ipsa operatio, sive actualitas. Facultatem autem dat Deus infundendo virtutem et gratiam, per quas efficitur homo potens et aptus ad operandum; sed ipsam operationem confert inquantum operatur in nobis interius movendo et instigando ad bonum." *In Ephes.*, cap. 3, lect. 2.
20. Matt., xxviii, 19-20.
21. Mark, xvi, 20.
22. "Sed constat quod officium apostolicum est praedicare veritatem; non ergo movetur ad contrarium veritatis, quod est mentiri." *In II ad Cor.*, cap. 1, lect. 5.
23. ". . . non debent praedicare nisi missi: . . . illi missi a Domino, possunt alios mittere . . . Et ita ex commissione Episcoporum et presbyterorum, possunt etiam alii multi ad praedicta mitti, et tamen illi missi a Domino intelliguntur, qui per potestatem a Domino traditam mittuntur, et omnes illi sic missi a praelatis Ecclesiarum scilicet Episcopis vel presbyteris, inter opitulatores computantur, quia ipso majoribus opem ferunt . . . et tamen cum aliquis ex commissione Episcopi praedicat, vel confessiones audit, Episcopus hoc facere intelligitur." *Contra Impugnantes Dei Cultum et Religionem*, cap. 4.
24. In Psalm., lxxvii, 18.
25. ". . . dicendum est quod sic erat sibi commissa praedicatio Gentilium, ut ad eam ex necessitate teneretur . . . , nec tamen erat ei prohibitum Judaeis praedicare, quamvis ad hoc non teneretur." *In Rom.*, cap. 11, lect. 2.
26. III, q. 42, art. 1 sc.
27. *Ibid.*, corp.
28. *Ibid.*, ad 1.
29. "'Et ego mitto vos' auctoritatem meo dando; ut qui vos audit, me audiat; et qui vos spernit, me spernat . . . Haec enim missione confert auctoritatem." *In Joan.*, xx, 21 (xxiv, p. 686).
30. "Praedicare et confessiones audire sunt jurisdictionis et ordinis simul." *Contra Impugnantes Dei Cultum et Religionem*, cap. 4.
31. "Timeo ne pseudo qui venit ad vos non missus, sed ex se, sicut fur et latro." *In II ad Cor.*, cap. 11, lect. 2.
32. "Fidelis est Deus, i.e., servat promissa sua. Promiserat autem mittere ad vos praedicatores veritatis." *Ibid.*, cap. 1, lect. 5.
33. In Lc., v, 4. (xxii, p. 362).
34. McVann, *op. cit.*, p. 58.
35. In Lc., ix, 2. (xxii, p. 604).
36. "Misit enim illos ut in eis sua auctoritas honeraretur, ut sua voluntas per eos omnibus exponeretur, ut fides per eos praedicaretur, et ut omnes non credentes per eos de infidelitate convinceretur." *Ibid.*

37. "Quattuor sunt in jussione: modus praedicandi verbi, verbum praedicatum, auctoritas injungentis, et ipsius praedicationis sublimitas." In *Lc.*, iii, 2. (xxii, p. 264).
38. "Tangit hic tria: locum praedicationis, rem praedicatam, et finem." In *Lc.*, iii, 3. (xxii, p. 265).
39. "Quattuor mandat. Primo quo vadant; secundo, quid dicant; tertio, quid faciant; quarto, quo fine." In *Matt.*, cap. 10.
40. "... ordinate procedunt, non usurpantes sibi praedicationis officium." In *Rom.*, cap. 10, lect. 2.
41. "Et mittit eos, sicut ipse missus est, scilicet ad praedicandum." In *Matt.*, cap. 10.
42. "Apostolus autem idem est quod missus. Sunt enim a Christo missi, quasi ejus auctoritatem et vicem gerentes . . . id est, cum plenitudine auctoritatis." In *Rom.*, cap. 1, lect. 4.
43. "... per verbum praedicatorum, quod est 'verbum Christi'; vel quia est de Christo, vel quia a Christo habent quod mittantur." *Ibid.*, cap. 10, lect. 2.
44. "Per missionem datur auctoritas Joanni. Per Scripturam auctoritas confertur his quae dixit." In *Lc.*, iii, 2. (xxii, p. 263).
45. *Joan.*, v, 39.
46. "omnes qui habent officium docendi fidem sive ex dignitatis gradu sicut sacerdotes, sive ex revelatione sicut prophetae, sive ex ministerio sicut doctores et praedicatores." In *Sent.*, Lib. III, dist. xxv, q. 2, art. 1, q. 1, ad 1.
47. "'Aut quomodo credent ei quem non audierunt?' Ille enim homo credere dicitur quae sibi ab aliis dicuntur quae ipse non videt . . . Est autem duplex auditus: unus quidem interior, quo quis audit a Deo revelante; alius autem auditus est, quo aliquis audit ab homine exterius loquente . . . Primus autem auditus non communiter pertinet ad omnes, sed proprie pertinet ad gratiam prophetiae, quae est gratia gratis data distincte aliquibus, sed non omnibus . . . Sed quia nunc loquitur de eo quod indistincte ad omnes pertinere potest, . . . ideo relinquitur quod hoc sit intelligendum de secundo auditu. Et ideo subdit: 'Quomodo ergo audient sine praedicante?' Auditus enim exterior est passio quaedam audientis, quae absque actione loquentis esse non potest. Unde et Dominus mandavit discipulis: 'Euntes in mundum universum, praedicate evangelium omni creaturae.' (*Mt.*, ult.) Ea vero quae fidei sunt, praedicatores a semetipsis non habent, sed a Deo . . . Et ideo Apostolus subdit. 'Quomodo vero praedicabunt nisi mittantur?' quasi dicat, non digne. Mittuntur autem aliqui a Domino dupliciter. 'Uno modo immediate ab ipso Deo per inspirationem internam. Hujus autem missionis signum quandoque quidem est sacrae Scripturae auctoritas. (Unde Joannes Baptista: '. . . sicut dixit Isaias') Quandoque autem signum hujus missionis est veritas eorum quae annuntiantur. Quandoque vero signum hujus missionis est operatio miraculi . . . Nec tamen ista duo ultima sufficienter demonstrant Dei missionem, praesertim cum aliquis annuntiat aliquid

contra fidem . . . Alio modo mittuntur aliqui a Deo mediante auctoritate praelatorum, qui gerunt vicem Dei." *In Rom.*, cap. 10, lect. 2.

48. "Tria autem sunt evidentia signa, quod praedicator a Domino mittatur ad Evangelium praedicandum. Primum est auctoritas mittentis, cuiusmodi est pontificis, et maxime pontificis ejus qui est loco Petri, immo loco Jesu Christi; unde qui ab eo mittitur a Christo mittitur." *In Lc.*, ix, 1-2. (VII, p. 217.)

A recent writer who has gathered the texts of St. Bonaventure which are concerned with preaching and attempted to form therefrom a theology of preaching, expresses Bonaventure's opinion concerning the apostolic mission thus: "Der Prediger muss von Gott selber 'eingesetzt' sein. Niemals wage er, von sich aus das Wort Gottes zu ergreifen. Nur dann, wenn er des Herrn Ruf horchend vernommen und 'gehorchend' aufgenommen hat, darf er der eigentliche Diener am göttlichen Worte sein. Der besondere Auftrag ist es, der ihn zum Gesandten Gottes macht und seinem Worte jenes Ansehen und jene verpflichtende Kraft verleiht, die der Predigt eigen sein muss; vom Herrn selber wird dem Berufenen Autorität geschenkt.

Bonaventura hat damit auf eine neue Voraussetzung hingewiesen, die Gott für die Verkündigung seines Wortes erfüllt wissen will. Der Prediger muss nicht nur mit göttlicher Gnade gesalbt sein, er muss auch eigens berufen und mit Autorität ausgestattet sein. . . .

Berufen und mit Autorität ausgestattet ist der Priester, sagt Bonaventura, und zwar auf Grund seiner besonderen Seelenprägung. . . .

Wenn wir bedenken, dass in der Kirche Gottes alle Weihegewalt von höchsten Hirten der Kirche und von den Bischöfen ausgeht so begreifen wir, dass die Beauftragung der Prediger, die Sendung im Namen Gottes, den Pontifices anheimgegeben ist. Dieses ist auch in dem Sinne wahr, dass sie es sind, welche die rechtliche Bevollmächtigung zur ordnungsgemässen Verkündigung erteilen. Die Notwendigkeit dieser juristischen Einsetzung ergibt sich aus der hierarchischen Gliederung der Kirche: Die in der Kirche Christi auftretende Autorität ist nämlich eine geordnete; sie muss geleitet sein vom Willen des Höchsten Herrn und mit diesem in Einklang stehen. Von diesem Willen zum Sprechen aufgefordert zu sein, kennzeichnet den Prediger als einen solchen, der vom Herrn Jesus Christus selber beauftragt ist." Erwin Eilers, *ofm, Gottes Wort, Eine Theologie der Predigt nach Bonaventura*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1941, pp. 73 f.

49. *Op. cit.*, p. 106.
 50. *Ibid.*, pp. 122 f. (Italics mine.)
 51. *Ibid.*, pp. 127 f. (Italics mine.)
 52. II-II, q. 187, art. 4, ad 2.
 53. Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.*, T. VI, p. 250.

54. "Qui vel habet curam vel professionem praedicandi, officium recepit seminandi." In Mt., xiii, 3. (xx, p. 550).
55. "Qui seminat enim est seminator, qui seminandi per curae susceptionem sive per voli emissionem suscepit officium." In Lc., viii, 5. (xxii, p. 528).
56. Ladner, R., in Mandonnet's *St. Dominique etc. (op. cit.)* Vol. II, p. 11; Scheeben, *op. cit.*, p. 139.
57. "Et erat praedicans." Ecce actus officii ad quem consecrantur Episcopi; sicut patet in manus impositione Episcoporum." In Lc., iv, 43. (xxii, p. 351).
58. "Hic incipit pars illa, in qua informat Ecclesiae Praelatos de praedicandi et docendi officio ad quod principaliter inventus est et traditus ordo Episcopalis." (xxii., p. 520).
59. III, q. 71, art. 4, ad 3.
60. "... monachorum, qui de sua sanctitate praesumentes, ministrorum Ecclesiae officia proprio arbitrio usurpabant, absolvendo scilicet peccatores, et praedicando absque alicujus auctoritate Episcopi, quod eis nullatenus licebat." *Contra Impugnantes Dei Cultum et Religionem*, cap. 4.
61. "Non enim minus sunt idonei religiosi ad praedicationis officium exequendum quam saeculares, nisi forte quatenus sint sub obedientia constituti, ut sic indigeant duplici licentia ad praedicandum, scilicet, licentia eorum quibus plebis cura committitur, et licentia praelatorum ordinis sui, sine qua eis nihil agere licet." *Contra Impugnantes Dei Cultum et Religionem*, cap. 4.
62. Cf. n. 22 above.
63. Cf. Ripoll-Bremond, *Bullarium Ordinis Praedicatorum* (Roma, 1729-40) Vol. I, Alexander VI "Ex Commisso nobis", p. 403; Clemens IV "Quidem temere sentientes", p. 455.
64. "utrum credat, quod liceat laicis utriusque sexus, viris scilicet et mulieribus, libere praedicare verbum Dei." Denzinger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, n. 687.
65. "Praedicare et confessiones audire sunt jurisdictionis et ordinis simul." *Contra Impugnantes Dei Cultum et Religionem*, cap. 4.
66. Cf. III, q. 67, art. 2, ad 1.
67. "quia quanto quis est celsior, tanto et illis erit potentior . . . Unde si saeculares sacerdotes non curati possunt hujusmodi facere ex commissione praelatorum, multo magis hoc possunt religiosi, si eis committatur. *De Perfectione Vitae Spiritualis*, cap. xxvi.
68. John, xx, 21.
69. John, vii, 16.
70. John, vii, 18.
71. Mark i, 22. Père Lagrange quotes Loisy approvingly: 'Il parlait 'comme ayant pouvoir', avec l'assurance que lui donnait sa mission, et la force conquérante d'une éloquence qui jaillissait du coeur. Rien ne ressemblait moins que cette parole vraiment inspirée, vivante et pénétrante, à l'enseignement ordinaire des scribes ou docteurs de la Loi.' *Evangile selon Saint Marc*, in loco (p. 21).

72. II-II, q. 177, art. 1.
73. "... efficacia praedicationis sit omnibus Apostolis ex uno, i.e., a gratia Dei." In *I ad Cor.*, cap. 15, lect. 1.
74. "Ipse verbo praedicatoris Deus confert virtutem sive gratiam praedicationis et aedificationis." In *Lc.*, vi, 15.
75. "Hoc enim verbum auctoritate, subtilitate, veritate, utilitate prae-cellit omne verbum. Auctoritate quidem quia Dei est qui primus omnium auctorum auctor est. Et ideo propheta non sibi verbum usurpat, sed se calamum auctoris vocat." In *Lc.*, viii, 1. (xxii, p. 521).
76. "Hic incipit pars quae est de verbi praedicati potentia in qua ipsos confirmat discipulos ad finem verbi, quod committitur eis praedicandum. Necesse enim est quod prius ipsam potentiam verbi Dei videant et experiantur: et quod postea committatur eis eadem potestas . . . Et in hoc est perfectio ordinis Apostolici et Episcopalis . . . Hoc autem verbum in omni virtute sua committitur praedicandum Apostolis, et apostolicis Episcopis; et ideo conveniens est ut virtutem ejus accipiant verum experimentum, tam in mundo sensibili, quam in mundo minori." In *Lc.*, viii, 22 (xxii, p. 548).
77. John, iii, 34.
78. Bolhovac, Paul, sj., "Die Stellung der Katholiken in USA," in *Stimmen der Zeit*, Nov., 1949, p. 135.

